

Scotland's Rural College

Managing fertiliser nitrogen to reduce nitrous oxide emissions and emission intensities from a cultivated Cambisol in Scotland

Hinton, NJ; Cloy, JM; Bell, MJ; Chadwick, DR; Topp, CFE; Rees, RM

Published in:
Geoderma Regional

DOI:
[10.1016/j.geodrs.2014.12.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geodrs.2014.12.002)

Print publication: 01/01/2015

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for pulished version (APA):

Hinton, NJ., Cloy, JM., Bell, MJ., Chadwick, DR., Topp, CFE., & Rees, RM. (2015). Managing fertiliser nitrogen to reduce nitrous oxide emissions and emission intensities from a cultivated Cambisol in Scotland. *Geoderma Regional*, 4, 55 - 65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geodrs.2014.12.002>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Managing fertiliser nitrogen to reduce nitrous oxide emissions and emission intensities
from a cultivated Cambisol in Scotland**

N.J. Hinton^a, J. M. Cloy^a, M. J. Bell^a, D.R. Chadwick^b, C.F.E. Topp^a, R.M. Rees^a

Corresponding author: Nicola J. Hinton. nicola.winning@sruc.ac.uk +44 7816 279185

joanna.cloy@sruc.ac.uk madeleine.bell@sruc.ac.uk bob.rees@sruc.ac.uk

d.chadwick@bangor.ac.uk kairsty.topp@sruc.ac.uk

^aScotland's Rural College (SRUC), King's Buildings, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3JG,
UK

^bSchool of Environment, Natural Resources and Geography, Bangor University, Bangor,
Gwynedd, LL57 2UW, UK

Keywords:

Nitrous oxide, agriculture, emission factors, emission intensities, fertiliser, nitrification inhibitor, sandy loam soil.

1. Introduction

Nitrous oxide (N_2O) is a powerful greenhouse gas (GHG) which accounts for 8 % of total global GHG emissions (Reay et al., 2012) and has a global warming potential 298 times greater than that of CO_2 (Forster et al., 2007). The breakdown of N_2O to NO in the stratosphere also results in the depletion of stratospheric ozone (Crutzen and Lelieveld, 2001). Although N_2O is a naturally occurring gas, there has been an increase in atmospheric concentration of 16 % since 1750 which is primarily attributed to emissions from fertilized agricultural soils (Davidson, 2009). Global annual emissions from agricultural soils are currently estimated to be around 4 Tg $\text{N}_2\text{O-N}$ (Reay et al., 2012).

The production of N_2O by fertilised arable soils is associated with the application of inorganic N fertilisers and manures or soil disturbance, which cause an increase in soil concentrations of ammonium (NH_4^+) and nitrate (NO_3^-); which is responsible for the subsequent production of N_2O as a byproduct of the microbial processes of nitrification and denitrification (Chapuis-Lardy et al., 2007; Inselbacher et al., 2011). Emissions from fertilised soils have high spatial and temporal variability (Flechard et al., 2007; Lilly et al., 2003) due to the influence of multiple factors such as soil water filled pore space (WFPS), soil compaction, pH and temperature on the N_2O source processes (Bessou et al., 2010; Castellano et al., 2010; Pierzynski et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2003). The high spatial and temporal variability of N_2O emissions from agricultural soils

41 makes it difficult to accurately assess annual fluxes. It has been suggested that a solution to this
42 problem is the use of high frequency long path length measurement techniques such as eddy
43 covariance (Flechard et al., 2007). However, such methods require large areas and are typically
44 of limited value in plot based field experiments where manipulation treatments are compared,
45 and emission factors (EFs) need to be calculated (as an unfertilised control area is needed too).
46 An alternative approach, used in this study, is the use of static chambers with high temporal and
47 spatial replication (Chadwick et al., 2014). Previous studies of N₂O emissions from agricultural
48 soils using the static closed chamber technique often involved the use of only a small number of
49 replicate chambers per treatment and a low sampling frequency over a short period of time. For
50 example, a number of studies have used six or less static chambers per treatment (Ball et al.,
51 1999; Clayton et al., 1997; Dobbie et al., 1999; Dobbie and Smith, 2003; Smith et al., 2012).
52 Previous studies have also often been based on short measurement periods ranging from 5 days
53 to 6 weeks after fertiliser application (Skiba and Ball, 2002; Skiba et al., 2002; Smith et al.,
54 2012). Furthermore, previous studies have not always adequately captured temporal dynamics
55 where gas samples were taken at intervals of 2-4 weeks (Rees et al., 2013).

56 The relationship between the amount of N fertiliser applied and the magnitude of N₂O emissions
57 is quantified through the use of an EF (EF1) which expresses the quantity of N₂O-N emitted as a
58 proportion of the N fertiliser applied. The EF calculation also accounts for background emissions
59 which are largely due to mineralisation of crop residues (IPCC, 2006). Bouwman (1996)
60 reviewed experiments of at least a year in length and recommended an EF (EF1) of 1.25 % of the
61 N applied to express the relationship between applied N fertiliser and N₂O emissions. The IPCC
62 subsequently used this as a “default EF” to enable calculation of countries’ N₂O emissions from
63 soils receiving inorganic fertiliser N (IPCC, 1996). This value has since been revised downwards

on the basis of more recent evidence to give an EF of 1 % of N applied for use in the Tier 1 methodology for calculating N₂O emissions (IPCC, 2006). However many countries including the UK have not yet adopted the 1 % EF in their national inventory calculations. This default EF attempts to estimate typical emissions across large spatial areas and time periods, however there is concern that local soil and climatic conditions, and the type and rate of fertiliser used can lead to significant variance from average conditions (Smith et al., 2012). The use of a 1.25 % EF has been controversial in Scotland where it has been demonstrated that large changes in soil WFPS may result in Scottish EFs which are atypical of the whole of the UK (Dobbie et al., 1999; Dobbie and Smith, 2003). This is reflected in calculated N₂O EFs ranging from 0.17 – 7 % for a range of N sources for Scottish agricultural soils (Clayton et al., 1997; Dobbie et al., 1999; Smith et al., 1998a). To improve the accuracy of agricultural N₂O reporting it is necessary for investigation into the effects of controlling variables on N₂O emissions and the appropriateness of utilising a 1.25 % EF, or the new 1 % EF, regardless of location, and this is particularly relevant in areas of the UK which may experience extreme or unusual climatic conditions.

Mitigation of agricultural N₂O emissions is necessary if we are to limit the contribution of agriculture to climate change. The use of nitrification inhibitors (NIs) such as dicyandiamide (DCD) which act to decrease N₂O emissions by deactivating the ammonia monooxygenase enzyme used in the primary stage of nitrification (Amberger, 1989) have proved successful in mitigating agricultural N₂O emissions (Di and Cameron, 2003; Di et al., 2007) and have also demonstrated the potential to increase crop yields (Abalos et al., 2014). However, there has been little investigation into the effectiveness of DCD in UK agricultural systems and more research in this area is required. Another N₂O mitigation option which requires further investigation is the

87 use of split applications of N fertiliser. Split applications result in the application of smaller
88 individual doses of fertiliser, which reduces surplus N in the soil and decreases the potential for
89 loss of N via transformation to N₂O or leaching, in addition to being more suitable for crop
90 requirements (Burton et al., 2008), potentially increasing the nitrogen use efficiency of fertilisers.
91 Reducing the amount of surplus N is an important method of decreasing N₂O emissions as it not
92 only has positive impacts on the environment but is also financially beneficial for the farmer.
93 Altering the amount or type of fertiliser applied is another means by which surplus N may be
94 decreased, and research has indicated that the use of urea rather than ammonium nitrate (AN)
95 fertiliser may result in lower N₂O emissions (Dobbie and Smith, 2003; Smith et al., 2012).

96 Although it is important to minimise N₂O emissions from agricultural soils, it will also be
97 necessary in the future to produce greater quantities of food, meaning that crop yield must not be
98 negatively impacted by mitigation options. Emission intensities i.e. the amount of N₂O produced
99 per unit of crop yield, are therefore a vital indicator of the potential of any N₂O mitigation option
100 (Van Groenigen et al., 2010), although research into this area has thus far been limited.

101 This work forms part of a nationwide project to assess the effect of a range of organic and
102 inorganic nitrogen fertiliser treatments on N₂O emissions from agricultural soils with the results
103 being used to improve agricultural management systems and to reduce uncertainty in the UK
104 agricultural greenhouse gas inventory (GHG, 2013). More specifically, the aims are to:

105 i). Compare N₂O emissions, calculated EFs and emission intensities from different inorganic
106 fertiliser treatments

107 ii). Investigate the efficacy of potential N₂O mitigation options.

iii). Assess the appropriateness of the use of the standard 1.25 % or 1 % EF for the area under investigation.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Site description

The experiment began in April 2011 at Gilchriston in south east Scotland (Grid reference: NT479658). Gilchriston is a commercial arable farm, selected for its location in one of the principal geoclimatic zones which support arable production in the UK. The site characteristics are described in Table 1. Soil pH, organic matter and bulk density were calculated using field measurements, other soil information was obtained from Hipkin (1989).

2.2 Experimental design

Nitrogen fertiliser treatments were compared that ranged from a control (0 kg N ha⁻¹) to 200 kg N ha⁻¹ and included the recommended application rate for the area of 120 kg N ha⁻¹ (Defra, 2010). The fertiliser was applied either in the form of ammonium nitrate (AN) or urea. Fertiliser was applied in two doses (three doses for one treatment) in April and May 2011, by hand to the entire plot, to simulate agronomic practice. The NI DCD was applied at a rate of 10 kg ha⁻¹ as a spray an hour after the application of AN and urea. Further details of treatments are presented in Table 2. The experimental layout consisted of 10 m x 3 m plots replicated three times for each treatment in a randomized block design. For the duration of the experiment, pesticides were applied according to standard recommendations, and P₂O₅ and K₂O were applied to all plots at rates of 60 kg ha⁻¹ and 90 kg ha⁻¹, respectively, in order to satisfy crop demand.

2.3 Gas and soil sampling, measurements and analysis

Nitrous oxide fluxes were measured at the experimental site over a one year period (7th April 2011 – 30th March 2012) using the static closed chamber technique (Chadwick et al., 2014; Clayton et al., 1994) and with a methodology that was consistent with Global Research Alliance guidelines (de Kleine and Harvey, 2012). Although the N₂O results are referred to as “annual” emissions, the precise number of days this period represents is 358 days. The intense N₂O sampling frequency was based on the assumption that most of the total direct N₂O emissions occur within the first month following each dose of fertiliser application (Dobbie et al., 1999). The sampling strategy therefore involved around 50 % of the total N₂O measurements occurring during this period of expected high emissions in order to capture the variations between treatments.

Five circular chambers made of opaque polypropylene (200 mm diameter, 300 mm height and soil surface area coverage of approximately 0.126 m²) were installed per plot, resulting in the use of 15 chambers per treatment. Chambers were installed by cutting a 5 cm deep slot into the soil and inserting the base of the chamber into this slot. Soil was tightly packed around the base of the chamber (on the outside) to ensure a good seal. The chambers were left in place for the whole experiment except when agricultural operations such as harvest deemed removal necessary. Extensions were added to the tops of the chambers during the growing season in order to avoid damaging the plants within the chambers. On each sampling occasion, aluminium lids were clipped onto the top of each chamber and the chamber remained covered for 40 minutes. The headspace was then sampled through a small sampling port in the lid using a syringe and gas samples were transferred to pre-evacuated 20-22 ml glass vials. Ambient and ‘linearity check’ gas samples were also collected. The linearity check involved collecting samples at 10 minute

intervals from 3 randomly selected chambers (1 from each block) throughout the sampling period. Sampling was conducted between 10:00 and 12:00 h to ensure consistency. See Chadwick et al. (2014) for further methodology information.

Gas samples were analysed for N₂O concentrations using an Agilent 7890A Gas Chromatograph (GC) fitted with an electron capture detector (Agilent Technologies, Berkshire, UK) and a CTC Analytics COMBI PAL autosampler (CTC Analytics, Hampshire, UK). The GC response was calibrated using certified N₂O gas standards (0.35, 1.1, 5.1, 10.7 ppm) and the N₂O limit of detection was 0.025ppm. Air temperature was recorded on every N₂O sampling occasion and chamber height was also measured for use in N₂O flux calculations. Daily N₂O fluxes were calculated using linear regression which assumes a linear increase in N₂O concentration in a known volume over a known period of time, and the ideal gas law (Saggar et al., 2008). Cumulative N₂O fluxes from each chamber were calculated using the trapezoidal rule (area under the curve) to interpolate fluxes between sampling points. For each treatment, cumulative fluxes were calculated using the mean of the 5 chambers per plot, in order to calculate a treatment mean cumulative emission value and associated standard error.

Composite soil samples consisting of five cores (0-10 cm depth) collected at random locations using a 30 mm diameter auger were taken from each block on each N₂O sampling occasion for soil gravimetric water content (GWC) determination, i.e. one soil moisture content measurement per block on each occasion. Composite soil samples from each plot were also collected in this way at approximately monthly intervals throughout the one-year experiment for soil mineral N content determination, i.e. generating one sample per plot. Fresh soil samples were sieved

(<4mm) and extracted using 2M KCl (soil to extractant ratio 1:2) for determination of soil ammonium ($\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$) and nitrate ($\text{NO}_3^-\text{-N}$) contents using a Skalar San⁺⁺ continuous flow autoanalyser (Skalar, York, UK). Soil bulk density was determined for each block through collection of intact soil samples using metal rings on frequent occasions throughout the experiment. Soil bulk density and GWC were used to calculate soil WFPS (%) on each gas sampling occasion (Robertson, 1999).

A meteorological station at the site recorded daily rainfall. Air and 10-cm depth soil temperatures were also recorded using a temperature probe (RS Components, Northamptonshire, UK) on each N_2O sampling occasion.

The crop was harvested on 22nd August 2011 using a small plot harvester which harvested an area of 15m^2 from each plot. Just prior to harvest, a random sample of 100 tillers per plot was also collected by hand. This was threshed and weighed to determine the ratio of grain to straw and chaff. The % dry matter and N content of the grain, and the mixed straw and chaff, from each plot was determined.

2.4 Emission Factor calculation

Emission factors, which express the N_2O -N emitted from each treatment as a percentage of the total N applied, were calculated (subtracting control values from each of the 3 blocks from corresponding treatment values as appropriate before calculating mean treatment EFs) using the following equation:

$$EF = \left(\frac{\text{Cumulative annual } \text{N}_2\text{O flux (kg } \text{N}_2\text{O-N)} - \text{cumulative annual } \text{N}_2\text{O flux from control (kg } \text{N}_2\text{O-N)}}{\text{N applied (kgN)}} \right) \times 100$$

EFs were calculated for three separate timescales: 1). An annual EF was calculated as recommended by Bouwman (1996). 2). A “seasonal” EF was calculated which included N₂O data up until harvest to take into account the effects of crop growth on N₂O emissions and the time taken for soil mineral N levels to return to “background” levels. 3). A “five week” EF was calculated for the 5 weeks following the first fertiliser application. This time scale was chosen as it has been reported that the majority of emissions take place during the 4 weeks following fertiliser application (Dobbie et al., 1999) and would therefore enable clearer identification of treatment effects. However, due to dry weather during this period there were very low N₂O emissions from all treatments, so it was extended to 5 weeks to include the large peak in emissions which occurred during May.

2.5 Statistical analysis

Statistical data analyses were carried out using Genstat (16.1). The occurrence of any significant differences in measurements between treatments was tested using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with blocks. Data were checked for normality before ANOVAs were applied and analysis of residuals was used to determine outliers. Two outliers were identified during the analysis of the cumulative N₂O data and the annual and seasonal EFs, these were from blocks 2 and 3 of the AN 40 treatment. These outliers were subsequently excluded from the analysis. Treatment effects were deemed significant if $p \leq 0.05$. Regression analysis was performed to determine the relationship between nitrogen applied and the cumulative annual emission. The REML procedure was used for this analysis with nitrogen level, specified as a variate, as the fixed factor, and the block was specified as the random factor. REML regression was also used to analyse the relationship between the daily N₂O emissions and the % WFPS with the block

specified as the random factor. In this case, the emissions were transformed using natural logarithms. Due to large negative emissions, $25 \text{ g N}_2\text{O-N ha}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$ was added to the emissions before transformation. On analysis of the residual plots, one outlier was identified and removed from the analysis (Block 2 on 7th July).

3. Results

3.1 Nitrous oxide fluxes

Nitrous oxide fluxes showed high temporal variation with most emissions occurring during a few intermittent flux episodes, and also varied widely between treatments (Figure 2). Emission maxima of $170\text{-}190 \text{ g N}_2\text{O-N ha}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$ from the AN 160 and AN 200 treatments occurred 13 days after the second fertiliser application in May 2011. Total N_2O emissions were higher in August than any other month with a maximum cumulative monthly value of $0.013 \text{ kg N}_2\text{O ha}^{-1}$ from the CON treatment. Negative N_2O fluxes were occasionally observed during the experimental period with the largest negative flux of $-18 \text{ g N}_2\text{O-N ha}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$ occurring for the AN 80 and urea 120 + NI treatments in July.

Cumulative N_2O emissions for the one year study period showed marked treatment effects (Figure 3), with a general increase in cumulative N_2O emissions associated with larger N applications. During the 1 way ANOVA with blocks, 2 outliers were observed from the analysis of the residuals. These were the cumulative emissions from blocks 2 and 3 of the AN 40 treatment and these were subsequently removed from the analysis. Maximum cumulative emissions were recorded from the AN 200 treatment with a value of $3.82 \text{ kg N}_2\text{O ha}^{-1}$

¹. Cumulative emissions from the AN 200 treatment were significantly higher ($p=0.009$. $\text{SED} =$

0.605) than from the CON, urea 120, urea 120 + NI, AN 120 + NI, AN 40 and AN 80 treatments. The lowest cumulative N₂O emissions were from the Urea 120 + NI treatment with a value of 1.32 kg N₂O ha⁻¹. This was a non significant 45 % reduction in cumulative emissions in comparison to the urea 120 treatment. There was a significant 38 % decrease in cumulative emissions from the AN 120 + NI treatment in comparison to the AN 120 treatment; however there was no significant difference between the AN 120 + NI and that AN (3 splits) . Cumulative N₂O emissions from the AN (3 splits) and urea 120 treatments showed a trend for lower emissions than from the AN 120 treatment by 11 % and 26 %.

3.2 Environmental conditions

The weather during the experimental period was atypical for this region, with a dry spring, followed by an unusually wet summer which coincided with low temperatures (Figure 1a and b). The high N₂O emissions observed during the summer corresponded with the occurrence of most of the large rainfall events during this period (Figures 1 and 2). The May emission peak occurred in a relatively dry period (the soil WFPS was 38 %) but during the peak in emissions in August the soil was considerably wetter (soil WFPS values of ~50 %). Despite the high rainfall, only 4 % of the measurement days had 50-70 % WFPS with all of the remaining days having < 50 % WFPS. A WFPS value of >60-70 % is generally associated with denitrification conditions, and hence with greater N₂O fluxes (Davidson, 1991).

3.3 Emission factors

Emission factors for each time period (annual, seasonal and 5 weeks) were calculated (Table 2). The maximum annual EF was 1.35 from the AN 120 treatment and the mean annual EF was

0.69, in comparison to the mean seasonal EF of 0.40 and the mean 5 week EF of 0.44. Two negative EFs were obtained for the annual and seasonal urea 120 + NI treatment. These represent positive emissions which are lower than the unfertilised control due to the EF calculation method used, in which control fluxes are subtracted from treatment fluxes. There were no significant differences between EFs for all treatments at any of the three timescales (EF annual, $p=0.082$; EF seasonal, $p=0.082$; EF 5 wk, $p=0.209$).

3.4 Soil mineral N

Soil NO_3^- -N and NH_4^+ -N concentrations increased following fertiliser application with a peak in NO_3^- -N concentration of 68 kg N ha^{-1} in the AN 200 treatment and a peak in NH_4^+ -N concentration of 57 kg N ha^{-1} in the urea 120 + NI treatment, just over a month after the final fertiliser application (Figure 4). As expected the mineral N concentrations increased as the application rate of AN fertiliser increased. The NI treatments acted to significantly increase NH_4^+ -N concentrations ($p<0.05$) and significantly decrease NO_3^- -N concentrations ($p<0.05$) in comparison to the non-NI amended treatments. Following peak soil NO_3^- -N and NH_4^+ -N concentrations, values decreased to $< 5 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$. The concentrations of both NO_3^- -N and NH_4^+ -N were consistently below 5 kg N ha^{-1} in the period between August 2011-March 2012.

3.5 Crop yield and yield scaled emissions

Crop yield (grain harvest at 15 % dry matter) ranged from a minimum of 1.46 t ha^{-1} for the control treatment to 9.30 t ha^{-1} for the AN 200 treatment (Figure 5a). Significantly greater crop yield was obtained from the AN 160 and AN 200 treatments ($p<0.001$, $\text{SED} = 0.1682$) than from all other treatments. The crop yield obtained was dependent on the amount of N fertiliser

applied, with greater crop yield obtained for larger applications of N fertiliser. Crop yield was significantly decreased by 9 % and 10 %, respectively for the AN 120 + NI and the urea 120 + NI treatments in comparison to their non NI amended counterparts and there was significantly lower crop yield from the AN (3 splits) treatment in comparison to the AN 120 treatment. Yield scaled emissions generally decreased with increasing rates of N fertiliser application from a maximum of 1.15 kg N₂O ton⁻¹ grain for the control treatment, to a minimum of 0.18 kg N₂O ton⁻¹ grain for the urea 120 + NI treatment (Figure 5b). There was a significant effect of treatment on yield scaled emissions (p=0.002, SED=0.1742) which showed that the control treatment had significantly higher emission intensities than the fertiliser treatments.

4. Discussion

4.1 Linearity of N₂O emissions with N application

This study demonstrated the value of a high intensity sampling strategy in assessing variability in N₂O emissions between fertiliser treatments. Greater applications of N fertiliser generally resulted in higher cumulative N₂O emissions due to the increase in soil NO₃⁻ and NH₄⁺ contents. There was a strong linear relationship (p<0.001) between the amount of N fertiliser applied and the magnitude of the cumulative N₂O emissions (Figure 6). Treatments AN 80 and AN 120 demonstrated smaller variability in N₂O emissions between blocks in comparison to the other treatments. The IPCC Tier 1 EF approach assumes that N₂O emissions are a linear function of N application (Philibert et al., 2012) and our results support this assumption, in contrast to some suggestions that the relationship between N input and N₂O emissions may be non-linear (Hoben et al., 2011; McSwiney and Robertson, 2005).

4.2 Cumulative N₂O emissions and environmental controls

Cumulative annual emissions from all treatments were particularly high in comparison to comparable experiments in this area. McTaggart et al. (1997) and Smith et al. (1998a) measured N₂O emissions from spring barley crops fertilised with 120 kg N ha⁻¹ in South East Scotland in 1993 and 1994-1995 respectively and reported emissions of 0.8 kg N₂O-N ha⁻¹, considerably lower than the 3.28 kg N₂O-N ha⁻¹ reported for the AN 120 treatment from our experiment. The lower frequency of measurements carried out by McTaggart et al. (1997) and Smith et al. (1998a) may explain their reported lower emissions. The high emissions observed during this experiment contrasts with work by Smith et al. (1998a), which reported that emissions from Scottish sites were generally small due to low spring and summer temperatures which reduces the production of N₂O. Most of the N₂O emissions are expected to occur in the four weeks following fertiliser application (Bouwman, 1996) and the mean soil temperature recorded during this period for our experiment was 13.3 °C, only 0.6 °C lower than the maximum mean monthly soil temperature observed in July which will have promoted high N₂O production.

Previous work by Dobbie et al. (1999), Flechard et al. (2007), Jones (2007) and Rees et al. (2013) has demonstrated that the key factors affecting N₂O emissions from N fertilised agricultural soils are % soil WFPS, soil temperature and soil mineral N. However, there are threshold levels of these factors and if this threshold is not exceeded by any of these variables then N₂O production may be limited (Dobbie and Smith, 2003; Topp et al., 2013). During the period immediately following fertiliser application and the subsequent summer months when soil mineral N contents and temperature were not limiting to N₂O production, the primary variable affecting emissions was % soil WFPS. This limiting effect was clearly demonstrated in this experiment in the period between the first fertiliser application and the large peak in emissions

approximately four weeks later. During this period the mean soil temperature of 13°C would not have been limiting to N₂O production, however, low % soil WFPS would have been (Figures 1 and 2). A large rainfall event in early May (Figure 1) increased % soil WFPS from a mean value of 27 % to 39 % which increased N₂O emissions (Figures 1 and 2). During the peaks in N₂O emissions in August, % soil WFPS values were approximately 46 % (Figures 1 and 2), however, at this time soil mineral N had returned to below what is considered a threshold level of 5 mg N kg⁻¹ (5.95 kg N ha⁻¹), which implies that soil WFPS has greater control over the potential for N₂O production than soil mineral N contents. The relationship between flux response and % soil WFPS was analysed for the highest N fertiliser treatment for this experiment. When N₂O data from the one year measurement period is used, including periods in which soil NO₃⁻ is below 5 mg N kg⁻¹, there is a significant positive relationship between N₂O and soil WFPS (p<0.001) (Figure 7a). When periods in which soil NO₃⁻ <5 mg N kg⁻¹ are removed (Figure 7) there is also a significant positive relationship between N₂O and soil WFPS (p<0.001) (Figure 7b), in agreement with Dobbie et al. (1999) who also found a significant relationship (p<0.05) when the same limitations were applied.

The observation of a significant relationship between N₂O emissions and % soil WFPS, even when soil NO₃⁻ was < 5mg N kg⁻¹ is in contrast to previous studies of Scottish arable sites which found no relationship between these variables below an NO₃⁻ threshold of 5mg N kg⁻¹ (Clayton et al., 1997; Dobbie et al., 1999; Smith et al., 1998a). The relationship between N₂O flux and % soil WFPS is related to the dominance of either nitrification or denitrification as the N₂O producing processes. Davidson (1991) suggested that denitrification predominates at soil WFPS >60 % and that at values <60 %, nitrification is the dominant process. In this study, despite greater than average annual rainfall, the 60 % WFPS threshold was never exceeded. This

combined with the return of NH_4^+ concentrations to background levels prior to the NO_3^- concentrations suggests that nitrification may have been the dominant N_2O production process.

4.3 Emission intensities

Crop yield increased with increasing rates of AN fertiliser application as expected due to the greater availability of NO_3^- and NH_4^+ in the soil for uptake by the growing crop. However, it is important to consider the amount of N_2O produced per unit of yield (yield scaled emissions, or yield intensity). This allows assessment of a greater part of the treatment's "life cycle" than just taking into account N_2O emissions, as ultimately for a fertiliser to be financially viable it must produce sufficient crop yield. The recommended fertiliser application rate of 120 kg N ha^{-1} , which was used in this experiment had yield scaled emissions of $0.39 \text{ kg N}_2\text{O ton}^{-1} \text{ grain}$. The optimum fertiliser application rate would produce a high crop yield but minimal N_2O emissions, and the results of this experiment demonstrate that the optimum fertiliser application would be AN 160 kg N ha^{-1} . This application rate provided a higher crop yield than the 120 kg N ha^{-1} application rate, but lower N_2O emissions, resulting in lower yield scaled emissions of $0.35 \text{ kg N}_2\text{O ton}^{-1} \text{ grain}$. Yield scaled emissions decreased with increasing rates of N fertiliser application at low application rates from $1.15 \text{ kg N}_2\text{O ton}^{-1} \text{ grain}$ for the control treatment to $0.28 \text{ kg N}_2\text{O ton}^{-1} \text{ grain}$ for the AN 80 treatment. Although the yield scaled emissions from the AN 80 treatment are relatively similar to the yield scaled emissions from the optimum AN 160 treatment, it must be considered that crop yields from the AN 160 treatment are 40 % higher, therefore it is advantageous to produce greater crop yields whilst not significantly increasing yield scaled emissions. The yield scaled emission results obtained are in contrast to the results of

a meta analysis carried out by Van Groenigen et al. (2010), which reported the lowest emission intensities following N application of 180-190 kg N ha⁻¹. We found no significant difference in yield scaled emissions from applications of 40 -200 kg N ha⁻¹ despite significantly greater crop yields at N application rates of 160 and 200 kg N ha⁻¹. Our yield scaled emission results indicate that we must avoid under fertilising crops if we are to minimise the risk of enhancing N₂O emissions whilst simultaneously obtaining poor crop yields.

4.4 Mitigation option effects on N₂O emissions and crop yield

The decrease in N₂O emissions through the use of the NI (DCD) is an important finding of this research. The use of DCD has proven effective in reducing N₂O emissions in previous studies conducted on grassland and spring barley sites in New Zealand and the UK (Di and Cameron, 2002, 2003; Di et al., 2007, 2010; McTaggart et al., 1997). However little work has been undertaken to examine the effectiveness of DCD on arable soils in Scotland. A previous field study in the UK investigating the effectiveness of DCD in reducing N₂O emissions from N fertilised arable crops found a 36 % reduction in emissions from spring barley when DCD was used (McTaggart et al., 1997). The successful inhibition of nitrification by DCD in this study is evident due to the significantly increased levels of NH₄⁺-N in the soils from the NI treatments and decreased soil NO₃⁻-N contents, in combination with the decreased N₂O emissions. DCD was more effective in reducing emissions from the AN 120 + NI treatment than from the urea 120 + NI treatment. This is in contrast to previous work which has demonstrated greater decreases in N₂O emissions when DCD was applied to urea fertilised soils in comparison to AN fertilised soils (McTaggart et al., 1997), as would be expected due to the higher quantities of soil NH₄⁺-N found in the urea treatment.

The potential of a 3 split AN fertiliser application and urea application (urea 120) to decrease cumulative N₂O emissions in comparison to the AN 120 treatment was also apparent as emissions were significantly decreased by 11 % and 26 % respectively. The decrease in N₂O emissions associated with the use of a 3 split fertiliser application suggests that the nitrogen use efficiency was increased. However, the mitigation effect was reasonably small and this might be explained by the fertiliser application relatively early in the growing season. The lower N₂O emissions from the urea 120 application in comparison to the AN 120 application is in agreement with the findings of Dobbie and Smith (2003) and Smith et al. (2012). However, the results of this study must be assessed with caution as ammonia (NH₃) emissions were not measured. Smith et al. (2012) reported that 22 % of urea N applied to arable soil is emitted as NH₃, in comparison to <3 % of ammonium nitrate N. The decrease in N₂O emissions associated with the urea application in this study may therefore be a reflection of greater loss of NH₃ than from the AN treatment resulting in lower soil mineral N concentrations and subsequently decreased potential for N₂O emissions. Evidence for this can be seen in the soil NH₄⁺ concentrations where the initially high NH₄⁺ concentration in the urea 120 treatment rapidly decreased to lower than the levels seen in the AN 120 treatment, perhaps indicating volatilisation of NH₃. The decreased N₂O emissions associated with the AN 120 (3 splits) and urea treatments were not associated with increased crop yields as may be expected if greater retention of N within the soil was taking place. Again, this supports the suggestion that considerable quantities of N could have been lost in the form of NH₃ from the urea treatment.

A particularly interesting finding of this research is the significant decrease in crop yield associated with the NI treatments. It was hypothesised that crop yield would be maintained or

increased during this experiment due to decreased rates of nitrification and reduced emissions of N_2O and therefore maintenance of higher levels of NH_4^+ in the soil, providing greater N availability for crop growth (Di and Cameron, 2002). However, it has been suggested that plants may preferentially uptake NO_3^- from the soil due to greater ease of transport of NO_3^- through the soil compared with NH_4^+ which is more tightly bound to the soil particles (Hofman and van Cleemput, 2004). If the NI prevented conversion of NH_4^+ to NO_3^- by nitrification, then crop N uptake and growth may suffer. The decrease in crop yield caused by the addition of a NI could have implications for the adoption of NIs as an N_2O mitigation strategy by the farming community, despite the financial benefits for the farmer associated with decreased loss of N through N_2O emissions. The yield results observed in this experiment are in contrast to those demonstrated in previous work in which DCD acted to increase crop or pasture yield (Di and Cameron, 2002; Liu et al., 2013; Pain et al., 1994) or had no effect on crop yield (Weiske et al., 2001). The decrease in N_2O emissions combined with the decrease in crop yield observed from the NI treatments resulted in a large (non significant) reduction in yield scaled emissions in comparison to the non NI amended treatments by 31 % for the AN 120 + NI treatment and 40 % for the urea 120 + NI treatment.

4.5 Sampling period effects on N_2O emissions and emission factors

This research demonstrated the considerable contribution of background emissions to emissions recorded from applied treatments. Cumulative emissions from the control treatments represent 43 % of annual emissions from the highest N fertiliser treatment and 51 % of emissions from the AN 120 treatment which are within the range of previously reported data. McTaggart et al. (1997) reported background emissions that contributed 75 % of the emissions from spring barley fertilised with 120 kg N ha^{-1} , and Smith et al. (2012) reported 26-67 % contribution of

control treatments to emissions from N fertilised treatments. This evidence suggests that background emissions from unfertilised arable crops can be high and represents a considerable proportion of the overall flux from fertilised crops. Smith et al. (2012) suggested that this high background flux from arable sites is due to mineralisation of crop residues which is also likely to have occurred at our experimental site following harvest of the previous oilseed rape crop.

Background emissions could also be considered as those occurring after the return of soil mineral N to background levels, which in this experiment occurred during August 2011. Emissions after this time could reflect crop residue inputs, N deep within the soil profile, remineralised fertiliser N or treatment effects from previous fertiliser events, all of which may confound emissions from the treatments of interest. Our work demonstrated the greatest cumulative monthly emissions in August with mean cumulative N_2O -N emissions of $1.35 \text{ kg N}_2\text{O-N ha}^{-1}$. Previous research has often not measured N_2O emissions for an entire year. For example, McTaggart et al. (1997) measured emissions from sowing until early June and although Smith et al. (1998a) measured N_2O emissions for a year from fertilisation, measurements were suspended during a period of low fluxes in the summer and resumed again after autumn cultivation. If we had not taken measurements during the summer, this period of high emissions would not have been recorded. The large emissions during the summer months are suggested to be due to underlying natural “background” variation in N_2O fluxes over space and time.

Although Bouwman (1996) and the IPCC recommend the use of N_2O emissions data from at least 12 months of measurements in order to calculate EFs to achieve an accurate reflection of management practices, we have calculated EFs over three timescales to analyse the effects of background N_2O emissions on EFs. There were interesting variations between the seasonal and annual EFs with annual EFs ($-0.28 - 1.35 \%$) generally being greater than seasonal EFs ($-0.04 -$

0.86 %) (Table 2) due to the contribution of emissions over the winter period. Calculating EFs over a longer time period did not always result in a greater EF, for example larger EFs were commonly obtained over the 5 week calculation period in comparison to the seasonal period. This is due to control emissions representing a lower proportion of total emissions immediately following fertiliser application, and the subtraction of these from treatment emissions during the EF calculation thereby causes greater calculated EFs. The question of which EF is more appropriate to use depends on the desired outcome. Our findings indicate that, despite most emissions usually occurring during the 5 week period after fertiliser application, the 5 week EF calculation is inappropriate, when environmental conditions (e.g. rainfall and temperature) after this time period are conducive to N₂O production. This work illustrated that there can be further significant N₂O emissions which should be included in EF calculations to accurately reflect N₂O EFs for arable soils. However, the decision to use a seasonal or annual EF is more complex. If it is desirable to calculate an EF which accurately reflects the effects of specific treatments on N₂O fluxes from arable soils then the results of this work suggest that a seasonal EF should be used in order to remove the effects of background N₂O fluxes which are likely to be unrelated to the applied treatments. Seasonal EFs may therefore provide a more accurate indication of the emissions attributable to fertilisation and specific treatments which makes the use of year long EFs for this purpose questionable. However, this would require removal of a large part of the data set, which Smith et al. (2012) suggests would usually decrease the magnitude of calculated EFs by 30 % in comparison to those which include a full year's data.

4.6 Comparison to IPCC "default EF" and previously reported values

The mean EFs calculated in this experiment are considerably lower than the IPCC's standard EF1 value of 1.25 % which is currently applied to much of the UK, and also lower than the new

EF of 1 %. Mean annual and seasonal EFs were calculated for the purpose of comparison to the IPCC standard value and as such only treatments within the normal range of fertilisation were included (AN 80, AN 120, AN 160, Urea 120). In our study the mean annual EF from these treatments was 0.79 % and the mean seasonal EF was 0.56 %. The EFs of the NI amended treatments were lower than the mean annual EF, due to the decreased N₂O emissions associated with these treatments, however the AN (3 splits) treatment EF was higher than the mean annual EF although lower than the EF of the equivalent AN 120 treatment. The AN 120 treatment is representative of the amount of N fertiliser which would be commercially applied in comparable situations in Scotland. The annual EF for this treatment is 1.35 % which is greater than the IPCC Tier 1 EF of 1.25 % or 1 %. Previous research into EFs from spring barley in Eastern Scotland found EFs of 0.6 - 0.7 % (McTaggart et al., 1997; Smith et al., 1998 a,b), demonstrating a much smaller range of EFs than those found in this experiment. It is suggested that the large range of EFs obtained from this experiment are due to the range of fertiliser application rates, intense sampling frequency and unexpectedly large emissions from the control plots. Also, the unusual weather conditions over the study period which involved large amounts of rainfall over the summer months during which time the treatment effects were no longer occurring, resulted in large emissions which were not associated with individual treatments.

Smith et al. (1998a) compared EFs from Scottish arable and grassland sites to the data plotted by Bouwman (1996) and found that N₂O emissions as a proportion of applied N, from the Scottish sites, and in particular from the Scottish arable sites, are generally lower than from the rest of the UK. This difference has been suggested to be due to lower temperatures in Scotland resulting in lower N₂O emissions (Smith et al., 1998a). However, if just the EF calculated for the standard fertiliser application rate (AN 120) is considered, then the EF is higher than the IPCC's 1.25 %

default EF and the new 1 % EF. Again, this is suggested to be due to the unusual weather conditions experienced during the experimental period. Overall, the range of EFs obtained from this experiment appear to support the movement from the IPCC's 1.25 % EF to the 1 % EF when factors such as the climatic conditions are taken into account. It must also be considered that the experiment was only one year in length, and that to obtain a more accurate view of EFs from these treatments, more experiments of this type would be required in order to take into account variables such as soil and climate.

5. Conclusion

This research demonstrated that area based emissions of N₂O are linearly related to N input, supporting the IPCC's approach to calculating EFs. Soil % WFPS was shown to have a significant effect on the magnitude of N₂O emissions and to have greater control over N₂O production than soil mineral N. For this typical Scottish spring barley crop and soil system receiving mineral fertiliser, the optimum fertiliser application rate is 160 kg N ha⁻¹, as indicated by the calculated N₂O emission intensities of all treatments. Emission intensity results also highlight the need to avoid under-fertilisation of crops if crop yields are to be maintained whilst minimising N₂O emissions. The use of a NI, split fertiliser applications and urea instead of AN, showed the potential to reduce N₂O emissions, however, the amendment of treatments with a NI and 3 split treatment also decreased crop yield, raising questions over their suitability as N₂O mitigation options in arable agriculture and prompting the need for further investigation. The importance of the contribution of background emissions to calculated EFs was demonstrated and the need for year long measurements of N₂O emissions is questioned. Calculated annual EFs

were generally lower than the IPCC's default Tier 1 EF of 1.25 % and the new value of 1 %, but largely support movement to, and use of, this new EF value, although further research in other locations is required to assess its suitability for use throughout the UK.

Acknowledgements

This study was an output of the UK's Greenhouse Gas Platform programme aimed at improving the measurement and reporting of agricultural GHG emissions from Tier 1 to Tier 2. The authors are grateful to members of the GHG inventory project (particularly Dr John Williams and Dr Catherine Watson) for discussions regarding the methodology and approach to this work. Funding provided by the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development in Northern Ireland, the Scottish Government and the Welsh Government is gratefully acknowledged as well as technical assistance from John Parker at SRUC.

References

Abalos, D., Jeffery, S., Sanz-Cobena, A., Guardia, G. Vallejo, A. 2014. Meta-analysis of the effect of urease and nitrification inhibitors on crop productivity and nitrogen use efficiency. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* 18, 136–144.

553 Amberger, A. 1989. Research on DCD as a nitrification inhibitor and future outlook.
 554 Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 20, 1933–1955.
 555
 556 Ball, B., Scott, A., Parker, J. 1999. Field N₂O, CO₂ and CH₄ fluxes in relation to tillage,
 557 compaction and soil quality in Scotland. Soil and Tillage Research. 53, 29-39.
 558
 559 Bessou, C., Mary, B., Leonard, J., Roussel, M., Grehan, E., Gabrielle, B. 2010. Modelling soil
 560 compaction impacts on nitrous oxide emissions in arable fields. European Journal of Soil
 561 Science. 61, 348-363.
 562
 563 Bouwman, A. 1996. Direct emission of nitrous oxide from agricultural soils. Nutrient Cycling in
 564 agroecosystems. 46, 53-70.
 565
 566 Burton, D., Zebarth, B., Gillam, K., MacLeod, J. 2008. Effect of split application of fertilizer
 567 nitrogen on N₂O emissions from potatoes. Canadian Journal of Soil Science. 88, 229-239.
 568
 569 Castellano, M., Schmidt, J., Kaye, J., Walker, C., Graham, C., Lin, H., Dell, C. 2010.
 570 Hydrological and biogeochemical controls on the timing and magnitude of nitrous oxide flux
 571 across an agricultural landscape. Global Change Biology. 16, 2711-2720.
 572
 573 Chadwick D., Cardenas L.M., Misselbrook T., Smith K.A., Rees R.M., Watson C., McGeough,
 574 K.L., Williams J., Cloy J.M., Thorman R., Dhanoa D., 2014. Optimizing chamber methods for

575 measuring nitrous oxide emissions from plot-based agricultural European Journal of Soil Science
576 65 (2), 295-307.

577 Chapuis- Lardy, L., Wrage, N., Metay, A., Chotte, J., Bernoux, M. 2007. Soils, a sink for N₂O?
578 A Review. Global Change Biology. 13, 1-17.

579

580 Clayton, H., Arah, J., Smith, K. 1994. Measurement of nitrous oxide emissions from fertilized
581 grassland using closed chambers. Journal of Geophysical Research- Atmospheres. 99, 16599-
582 16607.

583

584 Clayton, H., McTaggart, I., Parker, J., Swan, L., Smith, K. 1997. Nitrous oxide emissions from
585 fertilised grassland: A 2-year study of the effects of N fertiliser form and environmental
586 conditions. Biology and fertility of soils. 25, 252-260.

587

588 Crutzen,P.J., Lelieveld, J. 2001. Human impacts on atmospheric chemistry. Annual Review of
589 Earth and Planetary Sciences. 29, 17-45.

590

591 Davidson, E. 1991. Fluxes of nitrous oxide and nitric oxide from terrestrial ecosystems. In
592 Microbial Production and Consumption of Greenhouse Gases: Methane, Nitrogen
593 Oxides and Halomethanes, eds J. E. Rogers and W. B. Whitman, pp. 219-235. American Society
594 of Microbiology., Washington, District of Columbia.

595

596 Davidson,E.A. 2009. The contribution of manure and fertilizer nitrogen to atmospheric nitrous
597 oxide since 1860. Nature Geoscience. 2, 659-662.

598 De Kleine, C. and Harvey, M. 2012. Nitrous oxide chamber methodology guidelines. Global
599 Research Alliance.
600

601 Defra Fertiliser Manual 8th Edition (RB209). (2010) TSO: Norwich, pp 1-249

602 Di, H., Cameron, K., Sherlock, R. 2007. Comparison of the effectiveness of a nitrification
603 inhibitor, dicyandiamide, in reducing nitrous oxide emissions in four different soils under
604 different climatic and management conditions. *Soil Use and Management*. 23, 1–9.
605

606 Di, H., Cameron, K., Sherlock, R., Shen, J., He, J., Winfield, C. 2010. Nitrous oxide emissions
607 from grazed grassland as affected by a nitrification inhibitor, dicyandiamide, and relationships
608 with ammonia-oxidizing bacteria and archaea *J Soils Sediments*. 10, 943–954.
609

610 Di, H., Cameron, K. 2002. The use of a nitrification inhibitor, dicyandiamide (DCD), to decrease
611 nitrate leaching and nitrous oxide emissions in a simulated grazed and irrigated
612 Grassland. *Soil Use and Management*. 18, 395-403.
613

614 Di, H., Cameron, K. 2003. Mitigation of nitrous oxide emissions in spray irrigated
615 grazed grassland by treating the soil with dicyandiamide, a nitrification inhibitor. *Soil Use and*
616 *Management*. 19, 284-290.
617

618 Dobbie, K., McTaggart, I., Smith, K. 1999. Nitrous oxide emissions from intensive agricultural
619 systems: variations between crops and seasons, key driving variables, and mean emission factors.
620 *Journal of Geophysical Research*. 104, 26 981- 26 899

621

622 Dobbie, K., Smith, K. 2003. Nitrous oxide emission factors for agricultural soil in Great Britain:

623 the impact of soil water-filled pore space and other controlling variables. *Global Change*

624 *Biology*. 9, 204–218.

625

626 Farquharson, R., Baldock, J. 2008. Concepts in modelling N₂O emissions from land use. *Plant*

627 *& Soil*. 309, 147–167.

628

629 Flechard, C.R., Ambus, P., Skiba, U., Rees, R.M., Hensen, A., van Amstel, A., Pol-van

630 Dasselaar, A.V., Soussana, J.F., Jones, M., Clifton-Brown, J., Raschi, A., Horvath, L., Neftel, A.,

631 Jocher, M., Ammann, C., Leifeld, J., Fuhrer, J., Calanca, P., Thalman, E., Pilegaard, K., Di

632 Marco, C., Campbell, C., Nemitz, E., Hargreaves, K.J., Levy, P.E., Ball, B.C., Jones, S.K., van

633 de Bulk, W.C.M., Groot, T., Blom, M., Domingues, R., Kasper, G., Allard, V., Ceschia, E.,

634 Cellier, P., Laville, P., Henault, C., Bizouard, F., Abdalla, M., Williams, M., Baronti, S., Berretti,

635 F., Grosz, B. 2007. Effects of climate and management intensity on nitrous oxide emissions in

636 grassland systems across Europe. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment*. 121, 135-152.

637 Forster, P., V. Ramaswamy, P. Artaxo, T. Berntsen, R. Betts, D.W. Fahey, J. Haywood, J. Lean,

638 D.C. Lowe, G. Myhre, J. Nganga, R. Prinn, G. Raga, M. Schulz., R. Van Dorland, 2007:

639 Changes in Atmospheric Constituents and in Radiative Forcing. In: *Climate Change 2007: The*

640 *Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the*

641 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M.

642 Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press,

643 Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

644

645 GHG, 2013. www.ghgplatform.org.uk Last accessed 27th June 2013.

646

647 Hipkin, J. 1989. Humble series. Soil map unit description. Soil Information For Scottish Soils

648 (SIFSS), The James Hutton Institute, UK.

649

650 Hoben, J., Gehl, R., Millar, N., Grace, P., Robertson, G. 2011. Nonlinear nitrous oxide (N₂O)

651 response to nitrogen fertilizer in on-farm corn crops of the US Midwest. *Global Change Biology*.

652 17, 1140–1152.

653

654 Hofman, G., van Cleemput, O. 2004. Soil and Plant Nitrogen. IFA, Paris, France.

655

656 Inselsbacher, E., Waneke, W., Ripka, R., Hackl, E., Sessitsch, A., Straussm S., Zechmeister-

657 Boltenstern, S. 2011. Greenhouse gas fluxes respond to different N fertilizer types due to altered

658 plant-soil-microbe interactions. *Plant and Soil*. 343, 17-35.

659

660 IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), 1996. Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for

661 National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Workbook, Module 4, Agriculture.

662

663 IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), 2006. Chapter 11. N₂O emissions from

664 managed soils, and CO₂ emissions from lime and urea application. Volume 4. Agriculture,

665 Forestry and other land use. IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.

666

667 Jones, S., Rees, R.M., Skiba, U., Ball, B. 2007. Influence of organic and mineral N fertilizer on
668 N₂O fluxes from a temperate grassland. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*. 121, 74–83.
669

670 Lilly, A., Ball, B., McTaggart, I., Horne, P. 2003. Spatial and temporal scaling of nitrous oxide
671 emissions from the field to the regional scale in Scotland. *Nutrient cycling in agroecosystems*.
672 66, 241-257.
673

674 Liu, C., Wang, K., Zheng, X. 2013. Effects of nitrification inhibitors (DCD and DMPP) on
675 nitrous oxide emission, crop yield and nitrogen uptake in a wheat–maize cropping system.
676 *Biogeosciences*. 10, 2427–2437.
677

678 McSwiney, C., Robertson, G. 2005. Nonlinear response of N₂O flux to incremental fertilizer
679 addition in a continuous maize (*Zea mays* L.) cropping system. *Global Change Biology*. 11,
680 1712–1719.
681

682 McTaggart, I., Clayton, H., Parker, J., Swan, L., Smith, K. 1997. Nitrous oxide emissions from
683 grassland and spring barley, following N fertiliser application with and without nitrification
684 inhibitors. *Biology and fertility of soils*. 25, 261-268.
685

686 Pain, B., Misselbrook, T., Rees, Y. 1994. Effects of nitrification inhibitor and acid addition to
687 cattle slurry on nitrogen losses and herbage yields. *Grass and Forage Science*. 49, 209-215.
688

689 Pierzynski, G., Sims, S., Vance, G. 2005. Soils and Environmental Quality. 3rd Edition. Taylor
690 and Francis, Florida, USA.

691

692 Philibert, A., Loyce, C., Makowski, D. 2012. Quantifying Uncertainties in N₂O Emission Due to
693 N Fertilizer Application in Cultivated Areas. PLoS ONE 7(11): e50950.
694 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0050950.

695

696 Reay,D.S., Davidson,E.A., Smith,K.A., Smith,P., Melillo,J.M., Dentener,F., Crutzen,P.J. 2012.
697 Global agriculture and nitrous oxide emissions. Nature Clim.Change. 2, 410-416.

698

699 Rees, R.M., Baddeley, J., Bhogal, A., Ball, B., Chadwick, D., Macleod, M., Lilly, A., Pappa, V.,
700 Thorman, R., Watson, C., Williams, J. 2013. Nitrous oxide mitigation in UK agriculture. Soil
701 Science and Plant Nutrition. 59:1, 3-15.

702

703 Robertson, G. 1999. Standard Soil Methods For Long-Term Ecological Research. Edited by G.
704 Robertson [And Others]. Oxford University Press.

705

706 Saggar, S., Tate, K., Giltrap, D., Singh, J. 2008. Soil-atmosphere exchange of nitrous oxide and
707 methane in New Zealand terrestrial ecosystems and their mitigation options: a review. Plant and
708 soil. 309, 25-42.

709

710 Skiba, U., Ball, B. 2002. The effect of soil texture and soil drainage on emissions of nitric oxide
711 and nitrous oxide. Soil use and management. 18, 56-60.

712

713 Skiba, U., van Dijk, S., Ball, B. 2002. The influence of tillage on NO and N₂O fluxes

714 under spring and winter barley. Soil use and management. 18, 340-345.

715

716 Smith, K., McTaggart, I., Dobbie, K., Conen, F. 1998a. Emissions of N₂O from Scottish

717 agricultural soils, as a function of fertilizer N. Nutrient cycling in agroecosystems. 52, 123-130.

718

719 Smith, K., Thomson, P., Clayton, H., McTaggart, I., Conen, F. 1998b. Effects of temperature,

720 water content and nitrogen fertilisation on emissions of nitrous oxide by soils. Atmospheric

721 environment 32:19, 3301-3309.

722 Smith, K., Ball, T., Conen, F., Dobbie, K., Massheder, J., Rey, A. 2003. Exchange of greenhouse

723 gases between soil and atmosphere: interactions of soil physical factors and biological processes.

724 European Journal of Soil Science. 54, 779-791.

725

726 Smith, K., Dobbie, K., Thorman, R., Watson, C., Chadwick, D., Yamulki, S., Ball, B. 2012. The

727 effect of N fertilizer forms on nitrous oxide emissions from UK arable land and grassland.

728 Nutrient cycling in agroecosystems. 93, 127-149.

729

730 Topp, C.F., Wang, W., Cloy, J.M., Rees, R.M., Hughes, G. 2013. Information Properties of

731 Boundary Line Models for N₂O Emissions from Agricultural Soils. Entropy. 15, 972-987.

732

733 Van Groenigen, J., Velthof, G., Oenema, O., Van Groenigen, K., Van Kessel, C. 2010. Towards
734 an agronomic assessment of N₂O emissions: a case study for arable crops. *European Journal of*
735 *Soil Science*. 61, 903-913.

736

737 Wieske, A., Benckiser, G., Herbert, T., Ottow, J. 2001. Influence of the nitrification inhibitor
738 3,4-dimethylpyrazole phosphate (DMPP) in comparison to dicyandiamide (DCD) on nitrous
739 oxide emissions, carbon dioxide fluxes and methane oxidation during 3 years of repeated
740 application in field experiments. *Biol Fertil Soils*, 34:109–117.

741

742

743

744

745

746

747